

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Similar amendments have been made to the specification. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected Claim 6 under § 112. Claim 6 has been amended addressing the Examiner's concerns.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,012, 098 issued to Bayeh, et al in 2000. A claim is anticipated if, and only if, each and every element set forth in the claim can be found expressly or inherently in a single piece of prior art. *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co, of California* 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Of the rejected Claims, Claims 1 and 7 are independent. Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 8-12 depend from Claim 7. Claim 1 is a method Claim. Claim 7 is a system claim for performing the method steps of Claim 1. Because, as discussed below, Claims 1 distinguish over Bayeh, so do the remaining claims. As such, the rejections of claims 2-12 under §102 will not be addressed directly.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for deploying a web-based application and requires the following limitations:

- (a) generating a data structure representing a flow and associated forms for the application;
- (b) associating with the application a plurality of style documents, ones of said documents being tailored to characteristics of different clients;
- (c) providing to a server a processor for processing said application;
- (d) in response to a request for a form from a client to the server, the processor accessing a set of data sources for the requested form defined in the application and aggregating the data into a single generated data document, the processor executing a style processor

for processing the generated data structure and a selected style document corresponding to the client characteristics to generate the requested form; and

(e) forwarding the form processed at the server to the client.

The Examiner asserts that the Bayeh, col. 3, line 63 through col. 4, line 10 teaches the first limitation. The cited section reads as follows:

To achieve the foregoing objects, and in accordance with the purpose of the invention as broadly described herein, the present invention provides a software-implemented process for use in a computing environment having a connection to a network, for using servlets to isolate data retrieval from data presentation formatting, comprising: (1) a client request; (2) one or more data servlets, each comprising: a subprocess for receiving the client request; a subprocess for using the client request to retrieve data from a database; and a subprocess for formatting the retrieved data into a first data stream; and (3) one or more rendering servlets, each comprising: a subprocess for receiving the first data stream, responsive to a subprocess in any of the data servlets for sending the first data stream to one of the rendering servlets; a subprocess for parsing the received first data stream

Nothing in the cited section teaches generating a data structure representing a flow and associated forms for the application as required by the first limitation. The cited section merely describes separate servlets for data retrieval and data presentation formatting. There is no mention of generating a data structure representing a flow.

The Examiner asserts that the Bayeh, col. 9, lines 4-10 teaches the second limitation. The cited section reads as follows:

The second type of input to the rendering servlet 85 is an Extensible Style Language ("XSL") style sheet 99. An XSL style sheet describes how XML information is to be presented as HTML. Using these two inputs, the rendering servlet 85 creates an HTML data stream 96'. This HTML data stream 96' represents similar content as the HTML data stream 96

While the cited section describes an XSL style sheet it does not teach "associating with the application a plurality of style documents, ones of said documents being tailored to characteristics of different clients" as required by the second limitation of Claim 1. More particularly, the cited section makes no mention of associating different style sheets with an application where each of the different style sheets are tailored to a different client.

The Examiner asserts that the Bayeh, col. 9, lines 4-8 teaches a portion of the third limitation – that portion requiring “the processor executing a style processor for processing the generated data structure and a selected style document corresponding to the client characteristics to generate the requested form.” The cited section reads as follows:

The second type of input to the rendering servlet 85 is an Extensible Style Language ("XSL") style sheet 99. An XSL style sheet describes how XML information is to be presented as HTML. Using these two inputs, the rendering servlet 85 creates an HTML data stream 96'. This HTML data stream 96' represents similar content as the HTML data stream 96

The cited section makes no mention of executing a style processor for processing the data structure generated according to the first limitation of Claim 12 and for processing a selected style document as required by the fourth limitation of Claim 1.

For these reasons, Claim 1 is felt to distinguish over Bayeh. Consequently Claims 2-12 are also felt to distinguish over Bayeh.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-12 are allowable over the art cited by the Examiner. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Jack H. McKinney
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,685
(208) 433-1991